Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ADIL HIRAMANEK, et al., Plaintiffs,

v.

RICHARD LOFTUS, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. <u>3:13-cv-00228-JD</u>

ORDER RE VEXATIOUS LITIGANT

Re: Dkt. No. 732

On September 28, 2016, Defendants Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara, and Beth Miller moved the Court to declare pro se plaintiff Adil Hiramanek a vexatious litigant subject to a pre-filing order. Dkt. No. 732. On October 31, 2016, Judge Ronald M. Whyte entered an order in a different case declaring Hiramanek a vexatious litigant and imposing narrowly tailored pre-filing requirements. Hiramanek v. California Judicial Council, et al., Case No. 5:15cv-4377-RMW, Dkt. No. 34 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 31, 2016). That order finds Hiramanek to be a vexatious litigant in this district for all cases, not just the one before Judge Whyte. Consequently, the motion here is terminated as moot.

The Court notes Hiramanek is engaging in this case in the same kind of litigation conduct that led to the vexatious litigant order. If Hiramanek continues to act in that manner, the Court will consider expanding the scope of the pre-filing requirements based on an assessment of (1) the number and nature of Hiramanek's court filings, (2) Hiramanek's motive in submitting those filings, and (3) whether Hiramanek's filings have caused other parties needless expense or imposed an unnecessary burden on the courts or court staff. See Molski v. Evergreen Dynasty Corp., 500 F.3d 1047, 1057-58 (9th Cir. 2007); see also De Long v. Hennessy, 912 F.2d 1144, 1148 (9th Cir. 1990) ("Flagrant abuse of the judicial process cannot be tolerated because it enables

Case 3:13-cv-00228-JD Document 769 Filed 11/15/16 Page 2 of 2

	2
	3
	4
	5
	5 6
	7
	8
	9
	10
	11
nia	12
liforr	13
Northern District of California	14
	15
n Dis	16
rthen	17
No	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25
	26

27

28

United States District Court

1

one person to preempt the use of judicial time that properly could be used to consider the
meritorious claims of other litigants."). Hiramanek is also advised that the Court may conside
other sanctions, including termination of electronic filing permission and monetary sanctions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 15, 2016

JAMES ONATO United States District Judge